

## CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION

### Advisory Committee on Diversity

January 28, 2002 Meeting

Holiday Inn Sacramento Capitol Plaza  
El Dorado / Diablo Conference Room  
300 J Street, Sacramento, California, 95615

#### Attendance

##### Commissioners:

Louis Vismara, Committee Co-Chair

Sandra Gutierrez, Committee Co-Chair

##### Participants:

Guadalupe Alonzo

Rafaela Frausto

Kate Warren

Irene Martinez

Alan Watahara

Portia S. Choi

Patricia Phipps

Carlene Davis

Lynn Yonekura

Donna Michelson

Maysee Yang

Diane Visencio

Whitcomb Hayslip

**Staff:** Jane Henderson, Emily Nahat, and Barbara Marquez

**Other Guests:** Linda Blong, Marci Hanson, Tony Appolloni, Cecilia Sandoval

#### Agenda item 1 – Welcome and Introduction

Dr. Vismara welcomed the participants and outlined the meeting objectives as follows:

- 1) Review and discuss the recommendations resulting from the Strategic Planning Process of the Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities and Special Needs Project.
- 2) Receive an update on various CCFC projects and initiatives
- 3) Discuss an Implementation Plan for the Equity Principles
- 4) Review and provide input on the Equity Principles Workshop planned for the upcoming Annual Statewide Conference, titled Terrific Three, Families, Communities, and Commissions Working Together.

He noted the Commission had been in existence for three years and commended members for their accomplished work, specifically the Equity Principles. He announced that Dr. Melanie Tervalon and Edna Marquez have resigned from this Committee due to other commitments and personal issues, and commended their contributions to the work of the Committee. Dr. Vismara requested nominations, input, or suggestions for their replacements and announced that the Commission would make the final selections. He indicated Ms. Barbara Marquez would be collecting suggestions.

#### Agenda item 2 – Approve October 29, 2001 meeting minutes

Ms. Donna Michelson identified a correction to page 10 indicating that her name should replace Ms. Irene Martinez regarding the comment “the assumption that the black communities are a homogeneous community...”. Dr. Vismara noted conflicting comments on page 19, Ms. Marquez explained the issue. Hearing no other opposition, the minutes were approved with corrections.

#### Agenda item 3 – Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities and Other Special Needs

Dr. Vismara introduced the report from Sonoma State University and San Francisco State University, entitled *Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities and Other Special Needs*. Dr. Vismara described the process that led to the report, which began with an overview of existing laws and needs both at the federal and state level. He explained that Sonoma State University and San Francisco State University then moved out into the communities with three regional stakeholder forums held at Fresno, Concord and Poma and a State Synthesis Group meeting

on January 8, 2002 where the ideas generated at the local level were synthesized with stakeholders, representatives, and relevant state and county department or agency individuals. He indicated that the themes had been incorporated into five broad areas producing an incredible product with practical applications. He introduced Dr Tony Apolloni representing the project. Dr. Apolloni explained that the report summarized the recommendations presented and included a synopsis of the three forums, including the breakdown of participants who attended (specifying that half were providers and half were parents). He thanked Dr. Vismara, Ms. Gutierrez, Ms. Irene Martinez, Mr. Whit Hayslip and Ms. Kate Warren for their participation in the local and statewide sessions.

Dr. Apolloni added that the process also involved a meeting with 12 parent groups throughout the state that were composed of parents not typically represented, i.e., Hmong, Hispanic, and African-American parents. He also referred to an initial teleconference comprised of experts from throughout the state called together to identify current challenges and unique issues for children with disabilities, specific to childcare, family focus services, accountability, leadership, and coordination of existing resources.

Ms. Michelson commented that the five recommendations from the synthesis meeting seemed vague compared those from the regional stakeholder meetings. Dr. Apolloni also explained the process of the synthesis meeting. He referred to Table 4 of the second report noting the similarities of the recommendations independently generated from the three regional forums and their high degree of congruence lending to the validity of the recommendations. Dr. Apolloni explained that the desired outcomes statement and the five recommendations were derived from the information received from the stakeholder forums. He indicated that prior to the synthesis meeting, the staff reviewed the five areas and 13 strategic recommendations in order to frame some more specific recommendations detailed in this final report. Dr. Vismara, who participated in the Concord regional meeting and the synthesis meeting, concurred that the recommendations presented at the synthesis meeting accurately captured the recommendations derived from the stakeholder meetings. Dr. Apolloni clarified that a layer of staff work made the transition from the regional forums to the synthesis group, which facilitated completion of a product. Ms. Kate Warren added that although the staff framed five key areas which were discussed at the synthesis group, input from the group included shifting how recommendations were framed, evaluating some of the questions, and adding another focus not originally included.

Dr. Apolloni and Ms. Linda Blong explained, in response to Ms. Gutierrez's question, that the participants had been kept abreast of the progress with copies of the synthesis report and the three regional reports including appendices. The notes from each of the work groups were posted on the Internet with notification by letter to all the participants. Ms. Gutierrez suggested also informing the Hmong and Spanish-speaking participants of the progress.

Dr. Apolloni requested that today's presentation and discussion with the Advisory Committee focus on needed modifications of or improvements to the five recommendations in terms of the following three questions:

1. Do the recommended activities effectively reflect the Principles on Equity, and where specifically could this be improved?
2. What specific opportunities do you see for families including those from diverse and traditionally unrepresented populations to be active partners in these activities?
3. How best can we integrate the recommended activities with the School Readiness Initiative and other CCFC supported projects?

He indicated that the input from the Committee would be incorporated into the report to the extent that it is consistent with the framework of recommendations. The modifications and improvements not fitting within the framework would be forwarded to the Commission, along with the report, but in a subsidiary report.

Dr. Apolloni introduced Dr. Marci Hanson describing her background and credentials. Dr. Hanson began her presentation with some background information on the process and resources drawn upon in developing the report and by highlighting the following points:

1. One of ten children has a disability.
2. Civil Rights. Children with disabilities were denied education in the early 1970's resulting in lawsuits based on Civil Rights laws. Although acknowledged by law, by practice, children with disabilities were still segregated and not given equal educational opportunities.

3. Prevention of negative impact and of costly intervention. Children who do not receive early intervention end up in more costly special education services later as the undiagnosed disability may produce secondary or tertiary needs as a child develops.
4. Information awareness. Parents poignantly expressed their inability to receive services and information on their child's disability.
5. Unidentified and unserved children. Children living in poverty, children of non mainstream culture, and children from non English-speaking backgrounds, are among some who were not able to interact at the same level as other children and not given the same access to the programs available in their community based on research and testimony.
6. Coordination and integration of services. Families need to find the services and ensure that the services are appropriate and address the disability.

Dr. Hanson presented the report's five recommendations:

1. Develop and implement early childhood inclusion resource teams in each county to connect support to the provider or parent. This entails integrating services and coordinating information awareness with the function of connecting parents to the services they need and connecting service providers to the supports that they need. Technical assistance service to help individual children and families within an individual service accommodate that child or to help providers find resources for a particular disability.
2. Develop and implement a statewide leadership and disability resource network to share successful models and practices. Individual communities could accomplish wonderful things, but without leadership on the statewide level, there would be no mechanism to share models or recommended practices between communities. The purpose of the statewide network would be to pull together the resource teams into a unit to exchange information, disseminate training opportunities throughout the state, and disseminate recommended practices. NECTAS, a National Technical Assistance Group, could provide support for this unit.
3. Develop and implement countywide, community-based, early screening identification programs. Many children in California are not receiving the services they need, and nationally, there is a disproportionate representation of certain cultural and ethnic groups in school age special education, and an underrepresentation of early childhood special education. Many children from "minority" groups are being identified at a later age resulting from bias, assessment difficulties, the lack of preventive early education services. Each county would evaluate the screening and assessment procedures in their county and map out existing resources, their gaps, and a plan for addressing those resources, map and implement a screening program on a continual basis to identify and refer children to appropriate services as needed.
4. Family resource centers to enable parents to better support their children and get them ready for school. Support family resource centers to enable families to better prepare their children with disabilities and other special needs for school. Three possible options based on the feedback from the regional forums were (particularly due to the lack of support existed for children with disabilities ages 3 to 5): 1) supplement the existing 54 Early Start Centers throughout the state, 2) create new family resources centers for children with disabilities and their parents, 3) create family resource centers for all families at a county-wide level with a disabilities resource within those centers.
5. To implement a public awareness campaign that addresses issues related to children with disabilities and other special needs. Include children with disabilities and special needs into the current Prop. 10 public awareness campaign addressing issues of "at risk" signs and informing families that early intervention was important and to seek and receive help. The National Information Center For Handicapped Children and Youth produces fantastic ads on available resources and shows individuals with disabilities in a competent role.

Dr. Apolloni requested specific feedback in relation to any one or all five of the recommendations with respect to the three questions stated above. Questions, clarifications, or comments on the recommendations followed.

- Concerning the first recommendation, Dr. Choi asked if outreach services would be provided for rural areas. Dr. Hanson responded that the report endorses outreach services, but the county would ultimately decide how to set up the program.
- Ms. Warren commented that the program articulated services to the families less than the services provided to the providers and added that the Federal Office of Special Education has found California to be seriously underserving children with disabilities birth to age three (serving only 3%).

- In response to Ms. Michelson's inquiry on evaluation of services, Dr. Hanson responded that the program recommended a single county resource for issues on disability and the evaluation would include a record of the number of contacts, the kinds of referrals, and the results of the referral and more specific evaluation procedures would be detailed if the Commission decided to pursue any or all of the recommendations.
- Concerning the second recommendation, Ms. Gutierrez inquired if networks currently existed. Dr. Hanson indicated the report identified some of the websites recommended by NECTAS and explained that 28 states had state technical assistance networks on disability resources but California did not have a network addressing this need. NECTAS, a federally funded agency, provided technical support in the preparation of the report with information on national programs and models and their implementation on a state level.
- Concerning the third recommendation, Dr. Yonekura commented that since many children were identified prenatally, a link with state perinatal services and genetics services would be beneficial. She also suggested to reflect children identified as "high risk" at birth on their birth certificate and link them to school readiness centers to start intervention both prenatally and after birth. Ms. Michelson brought up confidentiality issues regarding updating the birth certificate, and questioned the screening procedure. Dr. Hanson responded that a number of states have a massive child find screening program and that the state develops guidelines to be implemented at the county level.
- Dr. Choi commented that the CHDP (Child Health and Disabilities Prevention Program) would be the ideal organization to provide the screening of disabilities.
- Ms. Michelson clarified the reference of "county" in the report to mean the "Prop. 10 Commissions".
- Concerning the fourth recommendation, Ms. Michelson suggested a more generalized wording of "family center" versus a "family resource center" to appeal to a more diverse community. Ms. Warren identified the confusion surrounding family resource centers by several agencies or organizations, i.e. child abuse, OCAP programs, and Healthy Start programs. Dr. Vismara commented on recently enacted Senate Bill 511 establishing family empowerment centers on disability and suggested linking the family resource centers to existing resources. Ms. Frausto commented that in areas where there are neither Early Start Resource Centers nor the Substance Abuse Prevention Centers, organizations, whose original mission was not a family resource center, have evolved into family resource centers. Dr. Hanson commented that many of the centers were parent driven and not professionally driven.
- Concerning the fifth recommendation, Dr. Yonekura inquired if fact sheets or videos that are culturally and linguistically specific, include commonly asked questions and debunk culture specific myths would be available to encourage people to access services. Dr. Hanson noted the importance of this suggestion.
- In response to Dr. Choi's question if respite care was addressed, Dr. Hanson indicated that respite care was funded through regional center services and that parents continue to voice respite care as a concern.
- Ms. Michelson suggested reordering the recommendations by making the fifth recommendation the first recommendation, because a massive public education campaign was needed to reach the parents of "at risk" children in informal care. She recommended tying into existing programs already being implemented or proposed by the State Commission. Dr. Hanson explained that recommendation #5 was a global public awareness campaign and recommendation #1 was specifically designed to address the issue of resource teams providing support. She acknowledged that #5 could be a mechanism to distribute information regarding services and for contacting the resources teams (#1).

Dr. Apolloni requested comments on addressing the first question, "Do the recommended activities effectively reflect the Principles on Equity, and where specifically could this be improved?"

- Dr. Watahara posed his comments as follows:  
Recommendation 1: Discuss the issue of monitoring and accountability because a person needs to be responsible for overseeing that the information is accurate, timely, and could be included in information exchange. Evaluation appears to be based on a number and not on the quality of service. He recommended more emphasis on the qualitative aspect to ensure diverse populations are being reached effectively.  
Recommendation 3: Include monitoring and accountability functions. Aside from possible Prop. 10 funds, describe how counties could sustain an early screening and identification program without legislative mandate or otherwise. Recommended more details on how screening would be implemented, i.e. mandated by legislature, fiscal incentive, etc. and quality control monitored at the state level or Prop. 10 level.

- Dr. Yonekura commented that if a video covering “at risk” signs were included in the New Parent Kit. Parents would become the best source of referrals for screening (Recommendation #3).
- Ms. Martinez commented, in reference to all the recommendations, that the cultural and linguistic diversity of the Equity Principles could be more emphasized and explicit throughout the implementation of the recommendations, and specified, with reference to recommendation #1, to require a parent of a child with disabilities to be on the resource team. Ms. Davis suggested developing a recommendation addressing the issue of culturally and linguistically appropriate services for the underserved. The Equity Principles were weaved through the narrative, but not apparent when skimming the bullets, and described its importance at the policy level. In response to Ms. Blong’s request, Ms. Davis clarified that a specific recommendation be developed to address the Equity Principles as appropriate to the program as well as include Equity Principle language throughout the other recommendations. Ms. Davis also questioned how systemic changes and integration would be addressed.
- Mr. Hayslip commented that the five recommendations were disconnected and recommended examining the coordination and the relationship between the five recommendations. He discussed the dissatisfaction that was expressed at the stakeholder forums about the current delivery service system for the IDEA Part B and Part C services. He questioned Prop. 10’s obligation to monitor compliance of Part B and C, but feels Prop. 10 could bring some of this together and that families need more than Part B and C services. He explained that it was unclear how the various resources would work together and recommended consolidating overlapping resources.
- Ms. Yang added that as far as the need for linguistic and cultural competency that language interpreters be trained in the area of disability and special needs as the results of the screening or assessment may depend on the translation.
- Ms. Davis suggested adding a video addressing issues of children with disabilities or special needs to the New Parent Video.
- Dr. Watahara referred to the CHDP item mentioned by Dr. Choi and suggested including an affirmative statement “that CHDP was essential for the screening” so that language would be helpful sustaining those services. He referred to the issues and definitions in the wording of the “family resource center” and recommended using a more general term that is more encompassing.
- Dr. Vismara commented on integrating all five aspects of the recommendations into a comprehensive early navigation system. He questioned if the School Readiness Initiative (SRI) and the Master Plan for Education would be logical places to start this discussion. Mr. Hayslip commented on integrating or requiring some or all these recommendations into the SRI and was supportive of the concept of building the program into the SRI. Ms. Blong summarized Mr. Hayslip’s suggestion that aspects of the five recommendations should be requirement of the SRI. Dr. Vismara clarified that the SRI needed guidance on developing this program as it currently does not exist in the school systems, school districts, or in the regional centers, and specified that investing funds into the program was necessary as well as building models on which the program could be replicated. Mr. Hayslip commented that regional centers and schools were hesitant to participate in community collaboratives, so he is supportive of building a model to work from and to present to community collaborators showing how resources could be maximized as opposed to draining their existing resources.
- Ms. Davis commented on Recommendation #4 and the issue of mainstreaming children in childcare and educational settings and noted that option 3 was the only option consistent with the stated desire. She expressed the importance of being consistent and referred to the Fresno forum and the gap in services from children ages 3-5.

Dr. Apolloni requested comments on the second question, “What specific opportunities do you see for families including those from diverse and traditionally underrepresented populations to be active partners in these activities?”

- Ms. Yang suggested setting aside funding as a stipend for the parents for childcare, transportation, etc., or for advocates to work with families and help them reach and use the support services.
- Ms. Gutierrez commented that the emphasis on cultural and linguistic appropriate delivery mechanisms was also a key factor in getting families involved (Equity Principles). She mentioned that the public awareness campaign video could include a video on special needs and disabilities in the Kit if supported by the Committee.

- Ms. Michelson commented that opportunities for involving families necessitated pairing this organization with the Community-based Organization Outreach initiative to do the extensive outreach.
- Ms. Warren commented on establishing a unified birth to age 5 system. She emphasized the leverage the State Commission could provide to help support counties implement a noncategorical, unified approach to finding and serving all children who are “at risk” and who have disabilities. Ms. Warren also indicated that systems coordination requires direct community and parent leadership.
- Dr. Choi proposed building a model based on the CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates) system, used in child abuse, and suggested a sixth recommendation stating “that all the above recommendations incorporate the Equity Principles” linking with diverse community resources from throughout California.
- Mr. Hayslip discussed resource teams and suggested they work on the levels of homes, neighborhoods, churches, etc. and should be disassociated from the existing bureaucratic systems.
- Mr. Hayslip mentioned that other states are also struggling with developing a model addressing these issues and noted attention should be given to funding and funding sources when reviewing a model. He felt the State was not currently ready to implement a statewide system on this issue and recommended phase-in strategies toward resolving the issues.
- Dr. Phipps commented that many of these issues were incorporated into the Master Plan and suggested phasing these recommendations into the Master Plan proposing systems integration.
- Ms. Warren made a statement on behalf of families:
  - 1) These recommendations were not new and had been requested by them for the last 20 years.
  - 2) The statements of activities related specifically to children birth to age 5 with disabilities and their families, while scattered throughout the Master Plan, were very weak.
  - 3) She wanted realistic and meaningful input in things that would make a visible and tangible difference to the children with disabilities and their families in California. In response to Ms. Gutierrez’ request for results the State could produce, Ms. Warren explained that small portions of each recommendation was tangible, and since many of the state’s resolutions addressing these issues were vague and unclear, she would like the results to be clear.
- Ms. Michelson recommended the State Commission allocate more funding to the CBO Program to address outreach disability services. Ms. Michelson explained that the total allocation amounted to \$116,000 for the six counties in her region, which averaged about \$16,000 per county, to reach families, including families with children with disabilities. With this small amount of money, priorities need to be decided.

Dr. Apolloni commented that the program was looking to integrate the recommendations into existing CCFC supported projects (like the SRI) as well as develop new directions for the State Commission, and requested comments of this subject. Dr. Apolloni reminded the committee that their charge as consultants was to develop the most efficient strategy to address these issues based on varied input from across the state. He requested input on the priority of addressing these issues and alternative strategies i.e. apply the program as a set, but in a more limited area or as a phase-in.

- Ms. Davis suggested that a priority recommendation would be to focus on the public awareness campaign.
- Dr. Watahara suggested that the consultants develop a process with a phase-in strategy and with a feeling of approachability and measurable impact for the families, parents, and children where they feel satisfied if phase two never occurred.
- Dr. Apolloni commented that the consultant group have been debating the issue of a pilot phase-in approach—but it would need to ensure a training, technical assistance, and dissemination model and study the results for continuous improvement and expansion.
- Ms. Warren identified a tangible priority in Recommendation #3 as “linking the exploration and development of improved community-based early screening and identification, specifically within the context of the SRI proposal.” In reference to Recommendation #1 and #4, she indicated that a community based provider of childcare or other service can access a tangible response from a knowledgeable source in their community and families can negotiate this complex service system, which means expansion of resource center type services for all disabilities up to age 5.

Dr. Henderson listed what she heard as the themes that generated from the discussion:

- 1) The recommendations were disconnected. Modifications are needed to build an integral system, it was suggested that in some cases more information was needed to make wise choices about how to make the connections and how to phase-in some recommendations, but the committee did not want another study. Bottom line: figure out a way to get going on something that will have some sustainability over time.
  - 2) There is the possibility of a need for some legislation to make the connections and to ensure monitoring and accountability. Prop. 10 can offer leadership and incentives.
  - 3) Look at a phased approach that can lead to more than pilot projects and one that can be strategically implemented in a way that would lead towards statewide service delivery as well as the identification of children with disabilities and special needs.
  - 4) Identification needed to be linked to services.
  - 5) Cultural and linguistic emphasis
  - 6) Public Awareness
- Ms. Emily Nahat added another component to Dr. Henderson's list: The assessment of existing and available resources and evaluation of the reconfiguration of the resources.
  - Ms. Michelson clarified that public awareness entailed reaching families through other means than media and discussed and alternative outreach efforts specifically in rural areas.
  - Dr. Yonekura commented that Recommendations #1 and #4 needed to be addressed before Recommendation #5 and #3 reasoning that before engaging public awareness (#5), resources must be available (#1) and suggested addressing Recommendations #1 and #4 locally while developing Recommendation #2 at the state level and when phasing-in Recommendation #3 and #5, the system would be ready to receive families. Dr. Vismara countered that screening facilities and resource facilities were available, but not connected or accessible and suggested developing a system that included all five recommendations in a comprehensive and cohesive manner.
  - In response to the time it would take to implement a system, Dr. Apolloni indicated that all the recommendations could be moved on and the amount of time would depend on the area of emphasis and referred to Dr. Yonekura's reasoning for prioritizing the recommendations.
  - Mr. Hayslip suggested offering an incentive to the local community to encourage participation of resource providers. Mr. Hayslip suggested combining Recommendation #4 with #1 to create teams that both the FRCs and families could access.
  - Ms. Warren reminded the committee that from the regional meetings it became apparent that strong parent leadership was an important element that needed to be preserved in developing this program.
  - Dr. Vismara asked how much linkage to schools and health systems would be required by this model, and Mr. Hayslip responded that an important element would be who to include as resource providers and that recommendation #2 should be linked with recommendation #1 and #4 in the initial phase.

Dr. Apolloni thanked the committee for their comments and suggestions and outlined as their timeline to prepare a report for the Commission to be at the State Office by the February 4, 2002. Dr. Vismara indicated that Sonoma State University and San Francisco State University would provide a report to the State Commission Meeting on February 14<sup>th</sup> in Los Angeles. Dr. Vismara thanked the consultants and the participants for a rich, productive and stimulating discussion and called for Public Comment.

#### **Public Comment on Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities and Other Special Needs**

Ms. Nancy Burns, President of the National Federation of the Blind of California, discussed the importance of public awareness and public education relating to blind children and blind parents. Ms. Burns explained that the National Federation of the Blind of California was the largest organization of blind people in the world and is affiliated with many chapters throughout the state of California, but was not reaching all the parents of blind children. Her plea to the committee was for more public awareness toward this issue and possible funding to continue and expand outreach workshops for parents of blind children, to provide positive role models for parents and blind children and to provide the opportunity for blind children to learn Braille with a view towards promoting a successful future. In response to Dr. Vismara's question of the number of children sight impaired, Ms. Burns estimated about 5,000 to 6,000 children were sight impaired in the state of California and she added that new legislation (SB 306) would help fund training for teachers to teach Braille. Ms. Davis recommended for staff to

connect Ms. Burns to the CBO Outreach Program. Ms. Warren commented that literacy issues include modes of communication to include children using sign language, Braille, etc.

Ms. Donita Stromgren, with the California Childcare Resource and Referral Network, expressed her pleasure at participating in the Concord Stakeholders Meeting as well as the Synthesis Meeting and found it a dynamic experience. She indicated that her comments applied to all of the Recommendations, but was specifically referring to Recommendation #1, and expressed the importance of continued flexibility for services to be implemented at the local level with clear parameters and guidelines. She was concerned with the regionalization of services and implied that parents may be more comfortable approaching and using locally-based services and requested the financial feasibility of locally-based services be explored. She supported avoiding the duplication of existing services, facilitating the coordination of those services and recommending that funding not only be provided to the coordinators, but that funding also be extended to the partners. She also remarked that without increased funding, service providers could not accommodate the additional families identified and referred for services and thus adding to the frustration of the current system.

**Adjourn for Lunch (Reconvened 1:15)**

**Agenda Item 4 – CCFC Report**

Dr. Henderson updated the Committee on the progress of current projects.

**1. Central Valley Farm Worker Demonstration Project.**

She mentioned that the Commission was fully committed to serving the needs of children of farm workers in the Central Valley. She updated that the Commission was in communication with the Central Valley Collaborative and was planning a series of meetings towards completing work on the proposal. She stated that the meeting would be held in Fresno where she and others would meet with county representatives to ensure continued progress and indicated that the counties would present this issue as a priority at the State Commission Retreat. Dr. Yonekura asked if the Farm Workers Demonstration Project needed bridge funding to continue their work. Dr. Henderson commented that the Central Valley Collaborative had not yet internalized the issues raised by this committee or the Commission and indicated that funding should wait until they were prepared to address some of the issues.

**2. Evaluation RFP**

Dr. Henderson provided an update on the RFP for statewide data collection and evaluation, noting the deadline of January 18<sup>th</sup>. She indicated a review panel would convene commencing January 30<sup>th</sup> to score the submitted proposals and make a recommendation to the State Commission on the contractor to be selected.

**Technical Assistance RFP**

Dr. Henderson provided an update on the Technical Assistance RFP that was released on schedule January 9<sup>th</sup> with nearly 200 organizations on the prospective bidder mailing list. She indicated that organizations were strongly encouraged to collaborate as teams on this immense project. She described the scope of work as including best and promising practices addressing culturally and linguistically diverse populations and populations with disabilities and other special needs, building capacity for local training and consulting, coordination with other TA providers, and networking with other County Commissions. She highlighted the cultural and language acquisition focus has been incorporated and fully integrated into the RFP which will necessitate that the prime contractor include many subcontractors in order to ensure the needed expertise was provided to meet the diverse needs. She outlined the process for securing a contract as follows: the TA RFP was on the website, a prebidders conference would be held January 29<sup>th</sup> for all the prospective bidders, proposals were due March 25<sup>th</sup>, proposals would be evaluated and recommendations presented to the Commission in April, and a contract would be in place by June 1<sup>st</sup>. She thanked Donna Michelson for her review of the RFP.

**Master Plan Workgroup**

Dr. Henderson explained that the Master Plan Workgroup met for the last time the previous Friday where extensive discussions were held on issues related to governance and finance resulting in some agreement. Subsequent discussion focused on a number of recommendations including paid family leave, dual language learning, and other visionary ideas. She indicated that the main concepts of the report were in place, but that the text was still being



revised to ensure appropriate focus, balance and responsiveness to the needs of the Legislative Committee that asked the Commission to support these activities. She stated the report would go to the legislature on February 15<sup>th</sup> and clarified that although Prop. 10 sponsored and funded the work of the working group, the report was not a Prop. 10 report. She detailed the procedure of publishing the report as follows: the legislature reviewing the report, public comment taken, revising the report, and finalizing the report some time this summer. She noted that once the report was public, committee members, as interested citizens, could provide public input.. She thanked the members of the Master Plan Workgroup present in the committee as well as Dr. Hanson who participated in the workgroup, for their hard work.

In response to Ms. Gutierrez's inquiry of how cultural and linguistic differences were handled, Dr. Henderson indicated that a major section of the report was dedicated to language, culture, and pedagogy, and that a major recommendation was dual language acquisition for all children and cultural and linguistic sensitivity built into all areas, specifically professional development. Dr. Phipps added that the dual language concept also applied to staff who work with children.

#### **School Readiness Initiative**

Dr. Henderson remarked that all 45 of the Counties that have low performing schools had chosen to participate in the School Readiness Initiative. There was also interest from all the other counties who would like to move in the direction of school readiness. She explained that the application process was "rolling", allowing time for the County Commissions to complete the developmental work needed and that the process was non-competitive allowing all counties to participate. She noted that phase one was currently in place with participation from the 19 county commissions listed: Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Mendocino, Riverside, Lassen, San Benito, Los Angeles, El Dorado, San Mateo, Fresno, Santa Clara, Napa, Lake, Siskiyou, Ventura, Alameda, Kern, Madera. She announced that February 4-6 was the reading and screening of those applications with readers from county commissions, State Commission staff, and local partners. She thanked Mr. Whit Hayslip for his help in initiating this process and in participating in the first review. She mentioned the grant awards would be announced March 1<sup>st</sup>. She confirmed that the applications would be rated on their compliance with the Equity Principles. In terms of outreach and information, she indicated that 6 teleconferences were planned, frequently asked questions were updated and posted on the website under the School Readiness icon, resources available on the website include the Orange County Phase One Applications, a compilation of School Readiness websites, research organizations, UCLA report on Technical Assistance Needs of County Commissions. county commissions' perspective on School Readiness and Technical Assistance Needs. A short-term Technical Assistance Agreement with UCLA was in place to provide technical assistance to the phase-one school readiness counties.

#### **Community-based Organization (CBO) Outreach Program**

Dr. Henderson thanked Ms. Carlene Davis and Mr. Ray Galindo for their work as representatives from the Advisory Committee who helped develop the structure and the contents of the first CBO Outreach Program. She stated the Commission's early recognition that a statewide media campaign would miss many communities without access to paid media, which initiated the CBO Program. She thanked the Commissioners, Ms. Gutierrez and Ms. Kim Belshe, designated to work with the contractors in the development of this program. She detailed that each of the 10 regions had elected to participate in one of the two releases; that RFPs had been issued in the Bay Area and the Sacramento Regions with copies provided in the meeting packet; and that the eight remaining regions were in the process of finalizing their RFP's for release in March. She explained that the \$12 million grant program would be awarded to CBOs throughout the state within the months of March and June. She mentioned that anyone interested in participating in the review process (or who had names to offer) should contact Stephanie Chew or Helen Sanchez at Rogers and Associates. Ms. Gutierrez added that Rogers and Associates were also interested receiving names of CBOs that should be sent this RFP.

#### **Kit for New Parents: Steps towards Language and Cultural Adaptation**

Dr. Henderson stated that the initial response had been very positive. With only two months into the program over 50,000 kits had been ordered and shipped to parents and providers. She indicated that the distribution plan was running smoothly, allowing attention toward the development of a process for determining the language and cultural adaptation of the kit to include alternative languages and formats, consideration of which pieces to adapt and how, and the associated cost of adaptations. She referred to Rogers and Associates and the committee as providing

guidance for this process. She indicated that a proposed process and timeline would be presented at the next meeting.

- Ms. Davis related that Los Angeles County was very concerned that the Kit was not serving the large Asian language communities. Ms. Gutierrez asked which Asian language would be most beneficial to them, and Ms. Davis responded that she would have to inquire. Ms. Gutierrez indicated that a process would have to be developed to determine the order of priority for production in alternative languages.
- Ms. Lupe Alonzo asked if the Committee was bound by “Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act”, which imposes direct obligations state/local governmental agencies to provide appropriate translation services for languages spoken by 5% or more of the population served. Ms. Marquez indicated that the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act is referenced in the CCFC Equity Principles.
- Ms. Visencio asked if the videos would be re-filmed with culture appropriate actors or just be translated. first. Dr. Choi suggested making an Asian Language video for the largest most needy community and dubbing or subtitling the same video for other Asian Languages in order to minimize production costs. Dr. Choi suggested prioritizing based on the census data in the category of U.S. born and foreign-born children and contacting the subcontractor who focused on Asians from the previous media campaign for their input on the most prominent Asian needs. Dr. Watahara discussed the importance of producing alternative language videos based on a community’ need as well as its size. Dr. Watahara asked who determined which Asian language to translate and the formula determining need. Ms. Gutierrez responded that the staff and Rogers and Associates would work and consult with the committee on these issues.
- Ms. Yang shared her experience working with Imada Wong Communication on Asian Language selection noting their staff spoke a variety of Asian Languages. She discussed the importance of conducting research to determine language selection and highlighted that language selection needed to consider cultural philosophy on the issue.
- Ms. Warren suggested generating a generic fact sheet with information on available family and child services regardless of immigration status.
- Dr. Vismara asked about the inclusion of materials related to issues of disability.
- Dr. Yonekura suggested addressing the issue of shame related to disability. Dr. Choi suggested reading the book “Developing Cross Cultural Competence: Guidelines for Working with Children and Families” which addressed shame related to disabilities and special needs in Asian communities.
- In response to Ms. Frausto’s question of distribution of the kit, Dr. Henderson indicated the kit was available through the local Commission, by phoning the 800 number, or by sending a postcard. A discussion followed where Ms. Frausto indicated that pediatricians were the primary distributors of the kit in her county and her desire for parenting and childcare facilities to distribute the kit to avoid needless referrals. Dr. Henderson advised her to discuss this with her local county commission or to contact Nicole Kassabian.
- Dr. Vismara commented that over \$23 million had been allocated to the Kit for New Parents and given the issues raised, asked Dr. Henderson to describe the long term evaluation on the effectiveness of the Kits. Dr. Henderson explained that the Commission approved funding for a longitudinal evaluation and indicated that she would present some of the language issues raised.

#### **Public Comment on the CCFC Report**

Ms. Nora O’Brien from the California Primary Care Association representing community health centers and clinics throughout the state, stated her concern about the lack of inclusion and comment on the Central Valley Farm Worker Project. She indicated that her organization treated over 300,000 farm workers throughout the state, many from the Central Valley, and commented on the willingness of her organization to continue to provide input in any way and at any level. She mentioned that her organization was sponsoring legislation addressing cultural and linguistic competency standards and on Medicaid portability throughout California, Washington and Oregon. Ms. Gutierrez indicated Ms. Marquez could be contacted regarding this issue and Ms. O’Brien offered to send her organization’s publications. Dr. Vismara inquired if her organization was in contact with the Central Valley Farm Worker Project group; Ms. O’Brien indicated that many of the local clinics and family health care network had unsuccessfully tried to provide input to make an impact. Dr. Choi commented that she had previously questioned the lack of contacts on the health component in the proposal and was told that the initial proposal was derived from information directly received from farm workers and not from the service providers.

#### **Agenda Item 5 – Equity Principles**

Ms. Cecilia Sandoval facilitated this agenda item. Following up on the Committee's interest in having an implementation plan to accompany the Equity Principles, referring to a list of broad activities (i.e., county surveys, distribution plan for the Equity Principles, etc.) created at previous meetings, Ms. Sandoval noted that the purpose for the activities or the results of the activities had not yet been defined. She outlined the following questions as the next steps towards developing an implementation plan that had a clearly stated purpose, outcomes, benchmarks, etc:

1. What impact or results are desired? What is to be achieved in the next year?
2. What are we going to hold our staff or ourselves accountable for?
3. What are the best strategies, vehicles or tools to achieve that?
4. What are the needed roles and action steps?
5. Who is responsible?
6. What is the cost?
7. What resources need to be dedicated?
8. What is the timeline?
9. What is the evaluation procedure?
10. What are the benchmarks that indicate progress?

Ms. Sandoval demonstrated that the activity list referenced above did not answer the first question and that the other questions were to help formulate a reply to the first question. She suggested the committee address the above questions to give staff direction in developing an implementation plan. She proposed the following result/outcome as an example to this thought process: "Culturally and linguistically appropriate special needs services are integrated into every county strategic plan as a priority or an overarching principle". Ms. Sandoval clarified that the purpose of the discussion was to identify the committee's expectation of how the Equity Principles would make a difference to the above result and indicated that identifying the resulting difference at the state level would provide guidance to the counties. She gave the example that county staff may possibly say "We're not sure we're going to adopt these Equity Principles because we don't know what that means for us," and indicated that the expectation for the Equity Principles needed to be clarified i.e. what was the expectation, at what level and by whom. Ms. Sandoval distributed a worksheet with sections to identify benchmarks, the costs, the personnel, the tools used, public/private information, etc.

Ms. Gutierrez indicated that the counties were under no authority to adopt the Equity Principles but that incentives to address the Principles could be added to Commission funding and noted that a small number of the 58 counties had adopted the Equity Principles. Ms. Visencio mentioned that her continual updates on the development of the Equity Principles to Ventura County facilitated their adoption. Ms. Nahat mentioned that county commissions may need the end goal defined and may need guidance on implementing the Principles. Dr. Watahara raised the issue of encouraging commissions to voluntarily adopt the Principles through education rather than force adoption.

There was much discussion on the process and suggested approach for developing an implementation plan for the Equity Principles. It was ultimately requested by Ms. Sandoval that the committee members would submit their completed worksheets and suggested statements be phrased "A year from now, we will have..." with Ms. Marquez, who would compile them and present them at the next meeting as we again attempt develop an implementation plan for the Equity Principles.

#### **Agenda Item 6 - Annual Statewide Conference**

Ms. Nahat discussed the logistics of the Statewide Conference (March 21 and 22) and encouraged the Committee members to register early as participation may be limited. She announced the following Keynote speakers: Eunice Kennedy Shriver, Dr. Elizabeth Schorr from Harvard (on building capacity of socio-economically disadvantaged communities to be involved in decision making about supporting their children and improving their outcomes) and Dr. Pedro Noguera from Harvard who has a wealth of experience of forging successful links between schools and culturally and linguistically diverse and low-income communities. The Workshop Themes are School Readiness, Responsiveness to Diversity, Effective Collaboration and Partnership Building Systems Integration.

Ms. Nahat thanked all the Committee members serving on the Statewide Conference Planning Committee (Brenda Blasingame, Rafaela Frausto, Irene Martinez, and Maysee Yang). Ms. Marquez shared that Ms. Frausto, as member of the conference planning committee, arranged for a Workshop on the Equity Principles at the Statewide Conference. Ms. Frausto suggested that the Workshop on the Equity Principles would provide an excellent forum for the committee to discuss the Equity Principles with county commissioners and staff, to explain their importance and relevance to the local work, and to encourage their adoption.

**Agenda Item 7 – Committee member reports and announcements**

Ms. Alonzo, from the Children's Advocacy Institute, provided an overview of the Governor's proposed FY 02/02 budget and its possible effects on services and programs for children and families.

Ms. Yang shared information on her planned workshop for the Statewide Conference. Her workshop is entitled, "Child Rearing Practice of the Hmong and other South East Asian Families; How it Affects School Readiness," is designed to provide the audience with an understanding what the Hmong cultural practices, common barriers to services, effective outreach strategies in working with this community, etc. She asked for suggestions.

- Ms. Gutierrez suggested researching if other county commissions had funded projects addressing this issue and use it as a model.
- Dr. Yonekura asked if the shame issues toward disabilities would be addressed, which Ms. Yang confirmed.
- Ms. Warren suggested recommending a book to people interested in disabilities related to this population "The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down."

Ms. Warren announced the passage of SB1096, looking at the issues of gaps in services birth to age 5 around the disability and early intervention system.

Ms. Gutierrez ended with a closing statement and summarized the items to be addressed in the next meeting as follows:

1. Follow-up with Sonoma State and the inclusion of today's comments
2. Committee working on the implementation plan of the Equity Principles as well as the workshop for the conference
3. Develop the plan, next steps, and timeline for the cultural and language adaptation of the New Parent Kit in terms of the Asian and Pacific Islander community as well as adaptations to cover the issues of disabilities.

Ms. Gutierrez shared that her term on the State Commission was about up and she was waiting to see what the next steps were. She commended the committee for their groundbreaking work on the issues of diversity and equity.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The committee meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.